Pamph
Anthrop
M

MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING DÉNÉ MORPHOLOGY
REMARKS ON DR. SAPIR'S WOULD-BE CORRIGENDA

by
A. G. Morice
m

LIBRARY
JUL 3 1917
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Reprinted from the AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST (N. S.) Vol. 19, No. 1;
January–March, 1917

MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING DÉNÉ MORPHOLOGY—REMARKS ON DR. SAPIR'S WOULD-BE CORRIGENDA

[Reprinted from the AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, Vol. 19, No. 1, Jan.–March, 1917.]

MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING DÉNÉ MORPHOLOGY—REMARKS ON DR. SAPIR'S WOULD-BE CORRIGENDA

THE fourth number of the *American Anthropologist* for 1915 contained a series of remarks by Dr. Sapir on my review of his *Notes on the Chasta Costa Phonology and Morphology* under a caption[1] to which exception could well be taken. It is not usual to see *errata* or *corrigenda* thus glaringly paraded by another than the party responsible for the production in which they are supposed to be found. In the present case such a title is a misnomer, and, even if warranted by the circumstances, it would come with a better grace from an old hand in the field of Déné linguistics. Most of the eleven statements which Dr. Sapir seems to criticize were simply proffered in a tentative way, as mere suggestions or bids for explanations.[2] One "corrects" assertions, not suggestions. Practically all of the few that were unequivocal affirmations are the expression of real facts, and therefore not any more *corrigenda* than the others. One exception refers to my taking Dr. Sapir's *A* for my *æ*, an error which is perhaps imputable to the printer, and should not certainly take eight pages of small text to "correct".[3] Moreover, with regard to two of his would-be *corrigenda* (Nos. 6 and 11), my critic admits that I was right.

I trust that, even in his kind reference to what he is pleased to call my "admirable mastery of the Carrier language," one is not to see something akin to a hint that I should confine myself to its exposition, a suggestion that has already appeared in print. To ward off the accusation of unbecoming presumption in treating of other related dialects, I am forced to remark, once for all, that a man who used to preach without an interpreter in Chilcotin before he knew one word of Carrier or Babine,

[1] *Corrigenda to Father Morice's "Chasta Costa and the Déné Languages of the North."* vol. 17, p. 765.

[2] "I more than suspect;" "might not Dr. Sapir's informant have misunderstood the questioner?" "unless I am very much mistaken," etc.

[3] Dr. Sapir is very obscure with regard to the definition of the value of his graphic signs. Nowhere can I find an explicit statement concerning the phonetic identity of his A; the nearest approach to it is an incidental remark (p. 278): "*æ* (*probably* identical with our A) in Carrier," he says.

and had acquired these two last idioms before he understood Sékanais, or who could catechize unaided in Nah'ane, five Déné dialects differing widely in their lexicon and grammar (with the exception of Carrier and Babine), that man, I say, should be able to detect errors or misapprehensions concerning phonetic and morphological points which run through the whole Déné linguistic family, especially when he has been, since 1882, studying those idioms, twenty-four years among those who speak them, and then with the help of all the literature bearing on the subject. It must be admitted that this help is not always infallible, because, occasionally, of an imperfect ear on the part of the transcriber, distractions or printer's errors, such as those which Dr. Sapir himself points out at the end of his remarks under Nos. 3 and 11.

This scholar claims that Chasta Costa *tc!Ac* "can have nothing to do with this *tθ'aθ*, but must go back to Ath.[1] *ᶻkʸ!ac*," and he props up his contention by remarking that, according to Dr. Goddard, *kīyauw* happens to have in Hupa the same signification, "birds," as his own *tc'Ac*. He likewise takes exception to my practically assimilating the suffix *-tc!e* of *li-tc!e* with that of my *li-tṣe*, declaring at the same time that this really corresponds to Ath. *kʸ!e*, which assertion he similarly bases on the *-ke* of Hupa *liñ-ke*.

He might not be far astray if the guttural sound was accompanied by the glottal explosion which we find in C.C.[2] *tc!Ac*, Carrier and Montagnais *tṣ̌æž* (according to my orthography), Navajo *tṣos* (do.), Loucheux *tṣ̌aw* (do.), as well as in the various equivalents of "woman" (*tṣe* or *tc!e*), an all-important explosion, or click, which Dr. Sapir renders by an exclamation point and I by a dot under the letter affected thereby. Dr. Sapir is himself so well aware of this that he obligingly supplies that "click" (p. 766) to the *ki-* of the first word and the *-ke* of the second! If Dr. Goddard really meant *k̟* (Sapir's *k!*) when he wrote *k*, may I ask how, in that case, he rendered the common *k* sound?[3]

[1] Athapascan.

[2] Chasta Costa.

[3] Years ago I criticized that scholar for having failed, as I thought, to render in his Hupa Texts the particular aspirated *t* (my *th*, the Franciscan Fathers' *tq*) common to all the Déné dialects. As a matter of fact, his *t* was the equivalent of my *th*, and he rendered the ordinary *t* by *d*. But I still fail to see how he expressed the real *d* sound, which does exist in Déné, though the natives themselves do not differentiate it from *t*. A. G. M.

The aspirated *k*, sound Father Morice writes κ; becomes everywhere in Hupa a continuant written *x*. The character *k* was therefore used for the sound Father Morice calls "click," and writes *k*. What Father Morice calls the common *k* is

As to the Hupa root *-tsōts* or *-tsōs*, which my critic adduces in this connection (Carrier, Chilcotin, Sékanais and Nah'ane *-tsus*, Babine *-tsôs*, Montagnais and Loucheux *-tsun*, Hare *-tsu*), it has no affinity with *-tsæž*.

With regard to his strictures under No. 4, I could not, with the best of will, change what I wrote concerning the point he refers to therein. He may refuse as stoutly as he can to agree with me; further study and a little speaking knowledge of a few Déné dialects will ultimately convince him that I am right in this connection. But we must understand each other. When I said that *thé-* "hinted" at the bottom of the water, I did not mean that it denoted exclusively the ground under the same (though that prefix has frequently reference thereto); I had especially in mind the water that is near the bottom of the body of water.

Now the very words which Dr. Sapir quotes to dispose of my assertion redound against him to the extent of proving even more than I meant. I even unnecessarily qualified my statement when I said that this was the case "at least in the north," since that prefix has the same value among some of the southern tribes, as is unwittingly shown by my critic himself. He adduces Navajo *tqĕ-lĩ* (my *thé-liñ*), "water-horse," which, forgetful, or unaware, of Indian exquisite accuracy in rendering linguistically the individual characteristics of natural elements, he imagines must mean literally "in-the-water horse." But I claim that he is mistaken in this. The native mind could not possibly form the concept of a horse without thinking of an animal with four feet. It is too radically exact for that when it is a question of concrete ideas. Even though the object denominated may be a real fish, the *name* given to it predicates the notion of legs and feet, which cannot be used as fins "in the water," but as means of locomotion "over" some hard substance, namely the *bottom* of the water.

This is so true that when, referring in Déné to the Eucharistic elements, I used the verbal desinence implying a personal, not material, complement, to show that these were none other than Our Lord Jesus-Christ himself, I could never prevail upon the Indians to follow me in this. They believed as firmly as I did in transsubstantiation; but their language was too strictly logical to use a verb connoting a personal complement when the *word* expressing that complement referred to a thing —a Sacrament, or the Eucharistic bread—not to a person.[1]

really intermediate in sonancy in Hupa and was written *q* when velar, *g* when prepalatal, and sometimes *k* when postpalatal as in ʟũk kai, "white. These facts have been called to the attention of Father Morice in print previously. Ed.

[1] The following passage from a letter lately received from Rev. Father Leopold,

Dr. Sapir gives as another proof(?) that Déné *thé-* simply refers to the water, and not to the bottom of it, the fact that the Kato verb expressing the idea of washing is in *t'e'-*. In the first place, this is not to the point, since my statement did not embrace southern linguistics. Then here again his pretended proof turns against him. The Chilcotins have indeed *thénasqæs* and the Carriers *thœnnaskræs* for "I wash"; but what kind of action do these terms represent to the native mind? How do the primitive aborigines wash? By laying over the clayey "bottom" of the shore of a sheet of water the soiled skin or blanket, on which they tread with bare feet and legs as do the wine-makers of Europe! I have witnessed this operation a number of times during my twenty-eight years' stay in British Columbia, and the Kato word referred to plainly hints that, though the natives who use it may have discarded this aboriginal method of washing, they none the less practised it formerly.

Did my diagnosis of the case stand in need of confirmation, I would have but to produce the fact that the Déné have an altogether different word to render the idea of washing either their hands or their face.

Yet, as these particular operations were very little practised formerly, the notions of washing and water bottom have remained so inseparably correlated in the Déné estimation that the term which they use to designate soap is radically identical with "mud" or "clay." The latter is called *kwœtl̤és* in Chilcotin, *hwotl̤œs* in Carrier, *wotl̤œs* in Sékanais, and practically the same among the Eastern Déné of the north. The root, which is a primary one (hence its striking similarity), is *-tl̤és*, *-tl̤œs*. Now the same dialects have respectively for "soap" *la-tl̤és*, *la-tl̤œs* and *ta-tl̤œs*, which, in the first two cases, mean "hands-mud," and in the last "eyes-mud."

The mode of washing skins or stuffs above referred to seems to have been originally unknown of the Nah'ane of the Far Northwest (the so-called Thałthan), who use in this connection a word, *œrathas'ôts*,[1] which simply implies that the action is done in the water, or with water, while

---

the chief contributor to the *Navaho Dictionary*, who had not been told of my contention concerning the true etymological meaning of southern *tqĕ-l̃i*, is especially illuminating: "There are," he writes (April 27), "such words as *tqĕ-l̃i*, water-horse, and *tqĕ-holtsodi*, water-ox. Both are mythological animals, that live in, and walk in, or *on the bottom* of the water. This last is expressed by the prefix *tqĕ*." The italics are mine.

[1] Henceforth I shall represent the hiatus by an apostrophe ('), instead of an upper dot (˙) as before, and shall retain the dot exclusively for the exploded sounds *t̤*, *k̤*, *l̤*, etc.

Chilcotin *thénasqœs* is analyzed: "I drag, rub (*-sqœs*) repeatedly (*-na-*)[1] over the bottom of the water (*thé-*)."

"Even in northern Athabaskan I do not find Father Morice's remark [on the real meaning of *thé-*] to apply without qualification, even if correct for Carrier." This is from Dr. Sapir's (p. 767). Let us then have recourse to his usual authorities, to which I shall add what I personally know of the Western Déné dialects. For "bottom of a body of water" the Montagnais say (with my spelling) *thèʀe;* the Hares, *thèè;* the Loucheux, *thè;* the Chilcotin, Carrier and Babine, *thèʀ*; the Sékanais, *tcéʀé.* This last is consistent with the foregoing, because in Sékanais *th* is convertible into *tc.* Ex.: "the Big Water" (the name of a British Columbia lake): Carrier, *Thû-thî;* Sékanais, *Tcû-tcî.*

As to *tha-*, my eagerness to clearly differentiate it from *thé-* induced me inadvertently to go a little too far. It is simply the equivalent in compounds—and in compounds only—of the word *thû, thô, tcû,* etc., "water," and may contribute to the formation of substantives, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. Here are a few examples:

Substantives: Navajo *thă-ba,* "shore" (for *tho-ba,* "water-edge"); Chilcotin *tha-zœl,* "soup" (for *thô-nezœl,* "water-warm"): Carrier *tha-tši,* "wave" (for *thû-tši,* lit. "water-head").

Adjectives: Chilcotin *tha-diñsat,*[2] "deep (water)," from *thô,* "water," and *nœzat,* "far off"; Babine *tha-ɬṭuk,* "shallow," from *thô,* "water," and *nṭuk,* "short"; Carrier *tha-sœḳœz,* "spring water" (for *thû-sœḳœz,* "water-cold").

Verbs: Chilcotin *tha-stnan,* "I drink (water)"; Carrier *tha-s'aih,* "I put in the water," etc.—too many verbs of that kind in all dialects for enumeration.

Adverbs: *tha-niz,* "at large on the water" (lit. "in the middle," *-niz,* "of the water," *th-*); *tha-ɬṭat,* "at the further end (of the lake)," etc.

This element appears "in compounds only," I have said. By this I meant to controvert Dr. Sapir's statement to the effect that "in several Mackenzie Valley dialects Ath. *ᶻt'a* even occurs as uncompounded noun stem" (p. 768). For this he relies, of course, on Petitot's dictionary,

[1] Etymologically, *na-* (a contraction of *nat,* "twice") implies reduplication; but it is also frequently used simply to show that the action is not done for the first time. In those cases, it even occasionally alters somewhat the meaning of the word. Thus in Carrier *thé-tœstli* is the equivalent of "I beseech"; changed to *thêna-dœstli,* it assumes the signification of "I say my prayers, I pray," because praying is an action which is normally done more than once.

[2] In Chilcotin *iñ* has the phonetic value of *in* in French *singe,* not of the same in English *sing.*

sub voce "flot." But here we have one of the cases when mere book knowledge falls short of its purpose. I never saw but one Mackenzie Valley Indian, and never spoke to her, any more than I ever addressed, or heard, a Navajo or a Hupa; yet I am positive, and if necessary will stake my reputation as a Carrier scholar (the only one which Sapir seems willing to concede) that the prefix *tha-* meaning "water"[1] as well as "flot",[2] is never used uncompounded anywhere. This would be against the morphological laws of the Déné dialects, such as my speaking knowledge of five of them and book study of many years' duration have revealed them to me. Were I not anxious to be as brief as possible, I might give my reasons for this.

In other words, you may see this terminological element written alone, as in Petitot's dictionary, or preceding independently without hyphen some other words, as in the work of the Franciscan Fathers; I insist that it cannot stand by itself, and needs the support of some other element to exist. It is to *thû*, etc., "water," what *tsé-* is to *ʁwon*, "fire"; *tšé-* to *tši*, "head",[3] *za-* to *-zé*, "mouth," *-tze* to *-tzî*, "heart," and *ne-* or *na-* to *nèn*, *nœn*, *yœn*, "earth," "ground."

But I have tarried too long on these two particles. Dr. Sapir almost ends his No. 6 criticism by adopting my suggestion that his desinence *-aɬ* should be *-yaɬ*. "I now incline to think that *-yaɬ* is correct," he admits. He is not quite so yielding in his No. 7, since he objects under that head that "there is plenty of evidence to show that Ath. *-ˣkʻe*, *-kʻen*, *-kʻĕn*, *-kʻi* frequently refers to, or implies, paddling," which I had declared is expressed by the root *-ṭo*, Sapir's equivalent of the idea of swimming. The instances he gives absolutely fail to convince me. Nay, some of them must have appeared of very little weight even to him.

Thus when Goddard renders Chipewayan *-kĩ* (*i. e.*, *ʁĩ*) by "to paddle a canoe, to travel by canoe," he is quite right; but this refers to

[1] Sapir's "in the water" is not quite exact, for several dialects have a desinential letter (generally *-t*) which is locative in intent (*thût*, "in the water"; *tha-tɬat*, "at the upper end of the lake," etc.), in the same way as final *-z* denotes recess from (*thûz*, *tha-tɬaz*, etc.).

[2] Petitot gives to this French word the signification of "water," which it has sometimes in French poetry, as may be seen by the words he produces as synonymous of "vague."

[3] A somewhat extreme case of compounding into which this particle enters is *tha-na-tšé-ɬe'dœs'œʁ*, "I do not drink again flat on the ground," which is thus analyzed: "I am not (*-ɬe-*) doing (*-œʁ*) with my bent body (*œ* replaced by the hiatus *'dœs-*) a renewed (*-na-*) action connected with water (*tha-*) wherein my head (*-tšé-*) takes a part."

locomotion, or the act of moving on the water through the action of a paddle, instead of, for instance, by swimming, *-pih*, "floating on a raft," *-tlat*, "poling up," *-thœz*, etc.

So is it with the example quoted from Father Legoff, whose remark is quite appropriate, and applies to all the Déné dialects that I know. *Naviguer en ramant* never meant "to paddle," any more than *j'avance en ramant*, which has the same signification. All these terms refer to locomotion which accidentally is effected by paddling, or the use of oars, on the water.

With regard to Sapir's criticism under No. 8, I merely stated the value of *-ɬaɬ* in Carrier and asked whether his informant might not have misunderstood him. He shows me by examples that this was not the case. I am satisfied. This point consisted of a statement by me which was perfectly correct, and of a question which is now answered. I do not see here any room for a *corrigendum*.

I wish I could be as brief in connection with his No. 9, which he subdivided into four parts. As usual, Sapir believes that he "abundantly" proves his case by references to other dialects. Were I sure that I do not impose on the reader's patience, I feel I could, by the same process, "super-abundantly" prove the contrary. The main point at issue here is either the absence of *t-* in my critic's root stems, such as *-se*, "to cry," *-si*, "to cause," or his cutting up his words in such a way that this same letter is made to belong to the preceding pronominal crement instead of the radical desinence. Thus he wrote *-t-lat*, for *-tlat*, root for the action of floating (which is in the same category as his *-ɬaɬ*); *-t-lo*, "to laugh," instead of *-tlo*, and now, in his last paper, *-t-nā* (*t'a-γit-nā*), which should be *-tnā* (*t'a-γi-tnā*, "thou drinkest").

Speaking of the root for sleeping in some dialects, he claims that "not *-tlaɬ*, but *-ɬaɬ* must be considered as the root stem," because, forsooth, the dental happens to be absent in the second persons singular and plural (*t'ī-ɬaɬ* and *t'ō-ɬaɬ*). He adds: "Were *-t-* part of the stem, there would be absolutely no reason for its disappearance in these forms" (p. 769). May I ask the learned doctor, firstly, whether this *t* is not found in the first person singular, or at least dual and plural, of his verb, and, secondly, why we find it in these persons of the following analogous verbs, and not in any of the second ones?

	Carrier	*Chilcotin*	*Navajo*
	I float	I am	I give him a horse
Sing.	*nœstlat*	*néstli*	*bānisłŏs'*
	nînlat	*nînli*	*bāñlos*
	nɑ̈llat	*henli*	*yēï'los*

Plur.	*nœtsœllat*	*nîtli*	*bādănīdlos'* [1]
	nœhlat	*nélli*	*bădănŏ'łos'*
	nœʀœllat	*qînli*	*yādei'los*
Dual	*nîtlat*, we float (both of us)		*bānīdlos'*

To get a proper idea of the real root stem in such verbs, we must go back to those dialects which have preserved it for occasional independent use. You ask, for instance, a Carrier: "How did you come? By canoe?" *Tatqahoh hwosaînya? ʀe pe a?* [2] He may have to answer you: *Awontuh; tlat pe œsqa;* "No, I did it by floating (on a raft)." *Lat* would here have absolutely no meaning.

In his Hupa material Goddard also gives this monosyllable instead of *tlat*; but it will be noticed that all the examples he produces as containing that root are in the third person, which, as we have seen, does not exhibit it in full. *-Tlat*, not *-lat*, is so evidently the true verbal stem that, under the transitive or causative form, the former appears in all the persons of all the tenses, both affirmative and negative, as we may see hereunder. The verb "I make him float" is conjugated as follows:

Affirmative

Present	*Past*	*Proximate Future*	*Eventual*
nœstlat	*nœsœstlat*	*nœthîstlœł*	*nôstlat*
nîłtlat	*nœsîłtlat*	*nœthaltlœł*	*nôłtlat*
nœ(yœ)łtlat	*nœ(yœ)łtlat*	*ne(i)thîłtlœł*	*nœ(yu)łtlat* [3]
nœtsœłtlat	*nœtsœłtlat*	*nœzthîłtlœł*	*nœtsułtlat*
nœłtlat	*nœsœłtlat*	*nœthiłtlœł*	*nułtlat*
nœʀœ(yœ)łtlat	*nœʀœ(yœ)łtlat*	*nœʀe(i)thîłtlœł*	*nœʀœ(yu)łtlat*
D. nîłtlat	*nœsîłtlat*	*nœthaltlœł*	*nôłtlat*

Negative

Present	*Past*	*Proximate Future*	*Eventual*
nœłœzœstlat	*nœłœstlal*	*nœlthœzîstlœł*	*nœłœzôstlat*
nœłœzîłtlat	*nœłîłtlal*	*nœlthœzaltlœł*	*nœłœzôłtlat*
nœłœ(yœ)łtlat	*nœłœ(yî)łtlal*	*nœłe(i)thîłtlœł*	*nœłœ(yu)łtlat*
nœltsœłtlat	*nœltsîłtlal*	*nœltsœthîłtlœł*	*nœltsułtlat*
nœłœzœłtlat	*nœłœłtlal*	*nœlthœzœłtlœł*	*nœłœzułtlat*
nœłœʀœ(yœ)łtlat	*nœłœʀœ(yî)łtlal*	*nœłœʀe(i)thîłtlœł*	*nœłœʀœ(yu)łtlat*
D. nœłœzîłtlat	*nœłîłtlal*	*nœlthœzaltlœł*	*nœłœzôłtlat*

[1] It must be borne in mind that the Dené ear perceives no difference between *d* and *t*.

[2] Of course, *Ke* does not literally mean "canoe," but "navigation."

[3] The particles within parentheses represent the personal complement without which a native will scarcely ever pronounce the word. This element may be omitted when the complement immediately precedes the verb; but even then it is not considered a useless redundance in Carrier. Ex.: "Paul will take all my cattle (from one place to another) by floating," *Pol smœstus tsiyauh nœyułtlat.*

The desinential roots *-tlœł* of both proximate futures and *-tlal* of the negative past tense are nothing else than the general stem *-tlat*, inflected in conformity with well known, and invariably observed, laws of Carrier verbal morphology.

In the same way, the desinence of Chilcotin *néstli*, "I am," which is in Carrier *œstli*, and similarly loses its *t-* in all but the first persons singular, dual and plural, always takes it back when used substantively or as a compound element; in other words, whenever it has to play independently its rôle of a root. Thus "I am dressed" is said: *e-tœne-œstli;* "thou art dressed," *e-tœne-înli*, etc., and the compound word for clothing will be *pe-tœne-œtli*, literally "that-wherewith man one-is."

So is it with the verbal stem *-tlo*, representing the idea of laughing, which Sapir would fain have us believe to be really *-lo*, since he writes it *-t-lo*, disassociating therefrom the *t* which he unduly refers to the pronominal element of the verb. This radical quite often fills the rôle of a genuine independent noun, in fact it is a regular noun, in all the dialects: Carrier, *tlo;* Navajo, *dlo;* Chilcotin, *tlâr;* Sékanais, *tlôh;* Nah'ane, *tlok;* Montagnais, *tlô* and *dlôr;* Hare, *tlô, klô*, Loucheux, *tlôg, dlôg*.

Here are a few instances of their use: *tlo sœzître*, "laughter killed me," [1]

[1] An idiotism, the like of which we find again in Navajo. In this connection, I think it worth while to quote again from Fr. Leopold's letter (written on receipt of a copy of my review of Dr. Sapir's paper), were it only to show how, for those who are familiar with them, the dialects of the south have really preserved even minor points of the Déné morphology, such as we find it in the north.

"What you say on pages 348–49 regarding the hiatus preceding the root of the verbs of vision obtains exactly in Navaho, where this root is: *'î, 'ĩ, 'ĩł* for the three tenses: *nesh'ĩ*, "I look at;" *neł'ĩ*, "I looked at;" *dínesh'ĩł*, "I will look at." Your remark concerning the word "wife" also applies to the Navaho word *'ad*, which is generally used with the possessive pronoun: *sha'ād, na'ād, ba'ād*, "my, your, his wife." The same hiatus occurs in Navaho before other verbal roots beginning with a vowel: *shana'a*, one of the forms for "give me." . . .

"Your remark on the double parts of the body holds good partly in Navaho: a one-eyed-man would be described as *binā'kis* (*'kūs* being a now obsolete word meaning 'half.' However, *shikhe* or *shila* is used in the singular or plural for "foot" or "hand." . . . Navaho has, as the Carrier, such personifying expressions as: *tqŏ shiniłqi*, "water kills me," or "I am drowning." In like manner they say: *dichî shiniłqi*, "hunger is killing me;" *dabă' shiniłqi*, 'thirst is killing me,' to express a high degree of hunger or thirst."

Had my correspondent been familiar with the Déné dialects of the north, he would have saved himself the trouble of giving me translations of his Navajo material. There is scarcely more than one or two words (*dichî* for "hunger" and the future of *nesh'ĩ, i. e., nec'iñ:* Chilcotin *nis'in*, Nah'ane *nes'ih*, Carrier *nœs'en*) which would not be understood in the north. Thus "my, thy, his wife" is said *sœ'at, nœ'at, pœ'at*, in

that is, "I am dying of laughing"; *tlo ɬœnne'dœsni*, "I am acting the buffoon," literally "laughter in-conformity-with I-say-many-things" (*ne'dœsni*); *tlo dîzta*, "I sit laughing"; *tlo dîjyin*, "I stand laughing"; *tlo dîzthi*, "I laugh while lying down," etc. *Lo* could not be thought of in this connection.[1]

With regard to the root for such an idea as weeping, *tso*, *tsœr* in most dialects, which Sapir again writes without its *t*, here is one tense of the verb to which it belongs, together with that of a Carrier verb which is morphologically identical:

Chilcotin	*Carrier*
hœssâ, I cry	*œssi'*, I am bad
hœntsâ	*întsi'*
hœtsâ	*ntsi'*
hetsâ	*tsîntsi'*
hatsâ	*œhtsi'*
ɢetsâ	*ʁîntsi'*
	Dual: *îtsi'*, both of us are bad

The Carrier for *hœssâ* is *œssœr*,[2] and its past, instead of making *retsèr* as in Chilcotin, becomes *îssé*, yielding the very same root as that of Sapir's Chasta Costa; but, of course, it does not fail to assume a *t* at all its other persons. Now *tso*, *tsœr* (not *so*, which means "sleet," not "weeping") is employed in exactly the same way as *tlo*. So is it with *tsi'*, not *si'*, which has no signification. It is given, under its independent form, the sense of badness, malice, wretchedness, while it is also used depreciatively in compounds, as in *ya-tsi'-dœs'aih* (see p. 570 of my last paper).

Chilcotin; Navajo *shana'a* is none other than Chilcotin *sani'añ* (last syllable as French *en*); *binā'kis* is simply Lower Carrier *bœna'ɬœz*, or *ɸœnaɬœz*, etc.

I repeat that this information was spontaneous on the part of Fr. Leopold, who had not been told of Dr. Sapir's criticism.

As to the former's remark concerning *shikhe* (or *ci-ʁe:* Chilcotin *sœʁe*) and *shila* (Chilcotin *sœ-lla*), it applies likewise to Northern Déné. Thus a Carrier will say: *sla îlɬét*, "my hand is swollen," without using the singularizing suffix—a point I had noted long ago in the outlines of a grammar which, duly developed, may later on be published. But whenever it is necessary to specify that one hand only is intended, this particle (*-ɬœz* in Carrier, *-ɬis* in Navajo, *-ɢœs*, in Chilcotin, etc.) must be agglutinated to the noun. You must then say: *sla-ɬœz*, "the half of my hands." Were you to use in this case the numeral "one," as is done in our European languages, nobody would understand you.

[1] Dr. Goddard duly transcribes that *t* when he gives us the Hupa correlatives *tcwũ* and *tcwe* for *tso*.

[2] This desinential *-r* is scarcely audible at all, and many Indians, especially among the younger generation, say *tso* instead of *tsœr*.

The part of Dr. Sapir's criticism where he is the most positive is in connection with syllabification. Here he declares that he "must emphatically disagree with" me (p. 771), and to show his utter disregard of what I wrote on this subject, he gives us *t'ā-γit-nā*, for *t'ā-γi-tnā*; *γit-lō* instead of *γi-tlō*, etc., thereby absolutely disfiguring the words and granting to their pronominal inflective part that which in reality pertains to their stem. I must therefore be allowed to make a confession:

Out of sheer presumption, and imagining that my 34 years' study of the Déné language had fitted me for the task of writing thereon from mere personal knowledge, the thought of consulting a book or published paper on the subject did not as much as occur to me when I wrote my review of Sapir's able essay on Chasta Costa. Now that he "emphatically" rejects my criticism on his peculiar way of dividing syllables, which, I claim, entails a wrong idea of the personal crements no less than of the nature of the verbal stems, I must have recourse to a book. On the other hand, since it is the fashion in certain quarters to have nothing to do with the morphological notions of the North, when treating of southern dialects, I open the *Navaho Dictionary* of the Franciscan Fathers, and find, page 10 of its second part, the following caution noted in as prominent a manner as possible:

> The digraphs and trigraphs used in this alphabet are not two or three distinct consonants in juxtaposition; but represent a single sound whenever they occur initially or otherwise. We hyphenize and pronounce *bi-tqo*, not *bit-qo; bi-t'ŏ"*, not *bit'-ŏ"*, etc., a distinction which is noticed by a Navaho ear.

This remark applies to pronouns and nouns, which are always coupled together as inseparably as the various elements of a verb, since the possessive pronoun (*bi-*), for instance, cannot any more stand without the support of its noun (*tqo*) than we could dream of *t'ā-γi-* existing without the immediate adjunction of its sense-giving stem *-tnā*. The above mentioned caution of the Navajo scholars is, therefore, just as much to the point when it is a question of verbs, as in connection with a pronominalo-substantival compound.

Hence let me tell my critic that he cannot possibly be half as emphatic concerning the accuracy of his syllabic divisions as I am with regard to their inaccuracy. His plea that his informant "was particularly careful in syllabifying" merely betrays an inexperience with Déné teachers which time will not fail to reveal. To prepare my monumental Dictionary of the Carrier language, which was destroyed by fire, I must have had, during the sixteen years that I worked on it, between 4,500 and 5,000 lessons or consultations, generally of several hours' duration.

I likewise took down vocabularies of the Chilcotin, Babine, Sékanais and Nah'ane dialects. Now I never once found a native instructor who could syllabify correctly, or in the same way as the preceding one! This task must be done by the scholar who has mastered the language sufficiently to be in a position to judge for himself, after a careful deductive process.

Perhaps the conjugation of one tense, the eventual, of the very verb of which Sapir gives one C. C. person (*t'ā-γi-tnā*) will help opening his eyes to the truth of my contention.

Chilcotin	*Carrier*
tha-ros-tnan, I shall drink	*tha-us-nai'*
tha-roñ-tnan	*tha-ûñ-tnai'*
tha-ro-tnan	*tha-u-tnai'*
tha-rô-tnan	*tha-tsu-tnai'*
tha-roh-tnan	*tha-uh-tnai'*
tha-qu-tnan	*tha-Ru-tnai'*
	Dual: *tha-ô-tnai'*

Here we have at a glance the full root *-tnan, -tnai'*. the equivalent of C. C. *-tnā*, Sékanais and Hare *-toñ*, Montagnais *-dañ*, fully distinct from the pronominal crements *-ros-, -us-; -roñ-, -ûñ-* etc., which latter are, in turn, clearly differentiated from the qualifying prefix *tha-*, which stands for *thû, thô*, "water," and indicates that the verb is intransitive, because it already contains in its make-up some sort of a complement. Who, with ever so slight a tincture of Déné morphology, would dream of having, for instance, *tha-st-nan*, "I drink"; *tha-înt-nan*, "thou drinkest," etc., any more than Montagnais *esd-añ*, Hare *el-oñ*?

As to Dr. Sapir's No. 10, while he admits that his verbal stem *-t'Ac* (or *-thœc*) is genetically related to my *-thœs*, which in all the dialects that I know of refers to the plural, he assures me that it is in Chasta Costa really used in connection with singular subjects. This is very surprising and well deserves deep investigation. Pending this, I accept his word for it, merely suggesting that this root is possibly not the equivalent of northern *-thœs*, which is strictly plural in intent, but of singular *-thih*, the desinential *-h* corresponding here to C. C. *-c*. Until I get incontrovertible evidence of it I cannot conceive of a plural form coming to express a singular concept.

With regard to Dr. Sapir's criticism under No. 11, he writes (p. 722): "Father Morice is, in my opinion, quite right." What, then, is *corrigendum* in this, his own statement or mine?

N. B.—I take this opportunity to remark that, in addition to those pointed out by Dr. Sapir, the following misprints occurred in my appreciation of his paper on the Chasta Costa language:

Page	instead of	read
560	*t.oḳœt*	*tl̥oḳœt*
561	*theʀ*	*thèʀ*
564	*œrœl'en*	*œʀœl'en*
564	*nuḳwéidîntsi'*	*nuhḳwéidîntsi'*
564	verb *-késsi'*	verb *-ḳéssi'*
567	*tsit*	*ts̥it*
567	(note 2) *ṭedœʀul*	*ṭedœʀu*
567	*hwenti*	*hwentil*
567	*łtsénœ-sœ'a*	*łts̥énœ-sœ'a*
570	*yadœzquh*	*yadœzquh*
570	*yadœzqéh*	*yadœzqéh*
570	*yatsé-sœst.s*	*yatšé-sœsłis*
571	(note 3) *tsé*	*tšé*
571	(do.) *tsi*	*tši* [1]

A. G. Morice, O.M.I.

Saint Boniface,
Manitoba, Canada.

[1] Just to show Dr. Sapir that, especially in material such as his and mine, an author is not always responsible for the printed mistakes, I will point out the fact that his *kᵘ!* does not correspond to my *q*, as he is made to say in note 16 of his first essay. This, at least, is a real *corrigendum*—but, I am sure, imputable to the printer alone.